DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 974 CE 080 526

AUTHOR	Zukas, Miriam; Malcolm, Janice
TITLE	Pedagogies for Lifelong Learning: Building Bridges or Building Walls? Supporting Lifelong Learning Working Paper.
PUB DATE	2000-07-00
NOTE	12p.; Paper contributed to the Supporting Lifelong Learning: Global Internet Colloquium (June-October 2000).
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.open.ac.uk/lifelong-learning/papers/393BCA95-009-66D4-000015700000157_Zukas-MalcolmPaper.doc.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Adult Educators; *Educational Environment; Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Educational Practices; Educational Principles; Educational Theories; Environmental Influences; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Learning Processes; *Lifelong Learning; Student Role; Systems Approach; *Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Contextual Learning; *Situated Learning; *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The United Kingdom does not yet have any lifelong learning pedagogies. The country has a stratified and segmented educational system, with little connection between those sectors that might be regarded as contributing to the concept of lifelong learning. The reasons for this lack of connections between sectors were examined during an 18-month study that included a literature review and resulted in identification of the following pedagogic "identities" assumed by adult educators: educator as critical practitioner; educator as psycho-diagnostician and facilitator of learning; educator as reflective practitioner; educator as situated learner within a community of practice; and educator as assurer of organizational quality and efficiency and deliverer of service to agreed or imposed standards. These identities were analyzed within the following conceptual dimensions: learning within a community versus individualized learning; disciplinary community versus pedagogic community; moral and social accountability versus organizational accountability; educator as "person in the world" versus anonymous/invisible educator; and student as "person in the world" versus anonymous/invisible learner. The analysis established that it is impossible to disentangle learners' situatedness from the educative process and that the split between adult education and higher education lies at least partly in the relationship between pedagogical theory and practice. (Contains 38 references.) (MN)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
School of Continuing Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Zukas
J. Malcolm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 443 974

Supporting Lifelong Learning Working Paper

Supporting Lifelong Learning: Global Internet Colloquium

Pedagogies for Lifelong Learning: Building Bridges or Building Walls?

Miriam Zukas and Janice Malcolm, University of Leeds

Situating lifelong learning

Lifelong learning pedagogies do not, as yet, exist in the UK. We have a stratified and segmented educational system in which there is little connection between those sectors which might be regarded as contributing to the virtual concept of lifelong learning. There is little conceptual connection between adult and further education, higher education, training and professional development and a growing wall between these sectors in the pedagogical literature. Even within obvious areas for overlap such as work-related learning, each sector has developed its own sub-specialism. The notion of lifelong learning and the theme of this colloquium implies some continuity within the system; we argue that, so far, lifelong learning pedagogies are marked by disjunctions.

These claims may seem overstated but one example demonstrates the point. Adult education and higher education in the UK still retain their identities as 'separate spheres' even when adult education is provided through universities. Despite the evidence that the efforts of adult educators to open up higher education for the students have borne fruit (adults now constitute the majority of the student population in universities), once they arrive in higher education, students move from being 'adult students' to 'mature students'. Whilst this might be considered a mere shift in nomenclature, we believe that it signifies discontinuity. In order to take account of these new students, we would expect the literature of higher education pedagogy to draw on the decades of work which adult educators have put in to developing appropriate curricula and pedagogies for so-called non-traditional students. The pedagogic focus of adult education was, after all, on how to adapt and transform traditional teaching practices and the content of courses to include students for whom the standard cultural capital of universities was opaque and alienating. Instead, the new specialism of teaching and learning in higher education has developed without reference to adult education and takes little account of who the students are; instead it concentrates upon the processes and outcomes of the classroom transaction, rather than its content, context or purpose.

Over the last eighteen months, we have been involved in a journey, trying to understand why there are so few connections between developments in pedagogy in the education of adults and those in higher education. Our initial project[1] was a literature-based study intended to develop theoretical frameworks for analysing pedagogical writing, and to trace the commonalities and divergences between pedagogic models evident in adult education and other established sectors of

[1] ESRC project no R000222794, *Models of the Educator in Higher Education: A Bibliographic and Conceptual Map. 1998-1999.*

CE 080 526

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1

education, and those emerging in the relatively new – and relatively undertheorised - field of higher education pedagogy. This, we hoped, would provide the basis for an analysis of the consequences of divergent development for both adult and higher education teaching. The study was UK-based, but utilised sources from throughout the Anglophone world and, to a lesser extent, from European writing originating outside the UK.

In our continuing work, we draw on the work of Lave and Wenger (1991) and more recently Wenger (1999) to try to understand the emerging pedagogic 'communities of practice' – particularly in higher education (Malcolm and Zukas, 2000). These ideas provide socio-cultural and pedagogic 'lenses' through which educational practice can be viewed, and help to clarify the reasons for the development of the intercommunal and epistemological splits between fields of pedagogic writing.

We focus somewhat unfashionably on educators, and on the dynamic relationship between educators and learners, understanding the classroom, the lecture theatre, the workplace as communities of practice. We believe that much of the current rhetoric of lifelong learning obscures this essential dynamic, and concentrates on learning in ways which, paradoxically, effectively leave learners without any real identity other than that of 'learners'.

Building identities

Our research has focused on identifying pedagogic 'identitites' implicit in current writing on higher education teaching and on creating a bibliographic map of the literature. Our aim has been, not to use these modes as reifications of educational practice, but rather to uncover the identities or 'masks' (Bailey, 1977) attributed to educators within the literature, and to consider their implications. Below, we develop two of these emergent identities to provide a synthesis of our previous work; we believe that this offers a possible framework for considering and evaluating pedagogies in lifelong learning.

We identified at least five pedagogic 'identities' in the literature we surveyed:

- *The educator as critical practitioner*
- *The educator as psycho-diagnostician and facilitator of learning*
- *The educator as reflective practitioner*
- *The educator as situated learner within a community of practice*
- *The educator as assurer of organisational quality and efficiency; deliverer of service to agreed or imposed standards*

These identities, or 'versions' of the educator, are neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive, but represent the range of understandings of pedagogic work apparent in the 'mainstream' higher education literature. In the process of arriving at and analysing these identities which we describe below, we used a number of conceptual 'dimensions' (some more useful than others) along which we could locate the characteristics and implications of each identity: a more detailed account of both the models and the process of analysis has been given elsewhere (Zukas and Malcolm, 1999).

In this paper we will compare two common conceptualisations of pedagogic identity in the respective literatures of higher education and adult education: the educator as 'critical practitioner', and the educator as 'psycho-diagnostician and facilitator of learning'. These polarised pedagogic identities are familiar to the adult education community of practice, representing the extreme positions in an ideological tussle which has rumbled through the field for

several years. They are chosen precisely because they are illustrative of a major difference between the two bodies of pedagogic literature: the identities are both strongly represented and contested within adult education, whilst in higher education, one identity is dominant, and the other is barely visible. In each case, we explore the prevalence and characteristics of the identity within higher education and adult education writing, analysing in each case the reasons for inclusion or exclusion of particular perspectives. We briefly describe the other three identities, although we do not incorporate them in our analysis.

We then utilise five of the dimensions, as follows, in order to gauge some of the implications of the critical practitioner and psycho-diagnostician identities for pedagogic practice: learning within a community vs. individualised learning; disciplinary community vs. pedagogic community; moral and social accountability vs. organisational accountability; educator as 'person in the world' vs. anonymous/invisible educator; and student as 'person in the world' vs. anonymous/invisible learner.

The educator as critical practitioner

The political roots of adult education and its strong social purpose tradition, from the activities of the Chartists through to contemporary discussions of 'diversity', have ensured that the 'why' and 'what' of adult education have always been as important as the 'how'; in fact content, purpose and process have been seen as inseparable elements of practice. The current generation of adult education writing has borrowed from a range of political traditions to bring a variety of critical, including feminist, social understandings to bear on pedagogy, and to produce various conceptualisations of critical practice. Postmodernist understandings can be seen as deriving from this same critical tradition. These diverse approaches consider the content of classroom practice as embodying and manifesting the power-knowledge relations which exist beyond the classroom. Of course, this is not to suggest that all adult education writing could possibly be characterised as promoting critical practice; adult education has its share of dull and mechanistic writing on decontextualised classroom techniques. Our point here is that it is a recognisable, familiar and easily accessed 'angle' on the pedagogy of adult education; adult educators are not generally surprised to be asked about the *purpose* of their pedagogic work as well as its processes.

Our reading of the higher education pedagogic literature has revealed a markedly different picture from that evident in adult education. There is a long and respected tradition of critical writing on the purposes of higher education and its various social, historical, epistemological and technological functions. In Britain, Barnett's prolific recent work on higher education and on 'critical being' (1997) is a major contribution to the debate on higher education as a social and political *institution*. In (inter-) disciplinary fields where different positionalities have challenged and transformed the nature of what counts as knowledge, e.g. in women's studies, critical pedagogy has emerged inevitably from the questioning of disciplinary discourses, structures and power relations. ('Critical' here includes feminist approaches - although the debate on their divergences continues [e.g. Gore, 1993]). Thus it is not difficult to find writing on feminist pedagogy, but it tends to be found within the specialist literature of the discipline itself, rather than in the literature of mainstream or 'straight' pedagogy. When we turn to the 'straight' pedagogic literature of higher education, which generally takes 'teaching and learning', rather than knowledge or purpose, as its starting point, versions of critical practice are much harder to find; it is almost like looking at the literature of an entirely different field of study. There are odd exceptions: Webb (1996), Rowland (1999) and Walker (1999) are examples of writers on higher education pedagogy who explicitly consider the 'why' of higher education in conjunction with the 'how'. Walker's references to such familiar guiding lights of critical adult education as Gramsci and Freire are almost unique in the field of higher education pedagogy; her background in South

African teacher education may be relevant. Beyond these few independent-minded exceptions, the educator as critical practitioner makes few appearances in the 'straight' higher education pedagogic literature. The instrumental focus on 'teaching and learning', as if it were a subject in its own right, means that higher education pedagogy has become fragmented and artificially dispersed over several distinct bodies of thought and literature.

The educator as psycho-diagnostician and facilitator of learning

Taking the first international exchange between British and N. American adult educators (Zukas, 1988) as a point for comparison, a notable difference between British and N. American adult education was the absence of psychological models of the learner and the teacher from the British literature. Over the last ten years or more, this difference has been less marked as N. American adult education has moved away from psychological models and frameworks, whilst adult education in Britain has continued not to use them. In contrast, psychology has provided the dominant framework for higher education pedagogic writing in Britain. There is a vast literature which begins with a focus on learners and educational transactions. It assumes that educators need to diagnose learners' needs, e.g. by identifying or taking into account learning styles or skills (e.g. Boyatzis and Kolb, 1991), or other individual predispositions, according to a favoured learning theory (Brown, 1993). Once characteristics and approaches to learning are identified, educators facilitate learning by using techniques and tools which meet those needs (e.g. Gibbs, 1992; Grenham et al, 1999). With learning foregrounded to this extent, pedagogy itself is conceptualised as little else than diagnosis and facilitation. This diagnostic approach is favoured by many of the 'founding fathers' of British higher education pedagogic research. In such approaches, psychological theories are used as tools to inform the ways in which practice takes place; in other words, theory determines practice. But, unfortunately, such theories do not emerge from practice; indeed, they are remarkable in that they discount the context and purpose of educational events, and the disciplinary settings in which such events take place.

Of course, not all psychological theory ignores context and settings. Socio-cultural psychology has transformed school teacher education and clarified the relational elements of pedagogy; research on situated cognition (Brown et al, 1988) has also emphasised the significance of context for teaching and learning. Such critical psychological approaches have not had a significant impact on higher education pedagogic writing. Why might this be? Tennant (1997) argues that, if the focus is on learning rather than on psychology, "it appears cumbersome and unnecessary to address the conceptual and methodological problems of psychological theory and research" (p.1). And this hints at another reason: if higher education pedagogic research is divorced from pedagogic practice, as it often is in UK institutional structures, teachers may assume that pedagogic researchers 'know' how it should be done – they are, after all, the experts. As in management education, they may demand to know 'how to'; and psycho-diagnostic and facilitative models offer apparently easy solutions. The contemporary concern with accountability and measurability (Malcolm and Zukas, 1999) encourages the search for such solutions, and the structural separation of higher education teacher training from school, adult and further education teacher training also lessens the impact of research across sectors . Increasingly, the commodification of higher education encourages a conceptualisation of learning as product, rather than process.

The educator as reflective practitioner

This model of the educator is very common in much of the current literature. It derives in general terms from the work of Schön (Schön, 1987) although it has been subjected to much modification and re-interpretation (e.g. Boud and Walker, 1998; Nicol, Kane and Wainwright, 1994). The range of interpretations, and the fact that they are frequently implicit, rather than explicated in

texts about teaching and learning in higher education, mean that 'reflective practice' has become a rather all-embracing term which diminishes in significance as its applications increase. It is interesting to note that whilst reflective practice has been much contested as a concept in the literature of childhood education and adult education (such as Bright, 1996; Ecclestone, 1996), its conceptual basis has only rarely been addressed in the higher education literature (Eraut, 1995). In most of its higher education manifestations it is presented as taken-for-granted 'good practice'. The clearest evidence of its conceptual dominance is the way it was incorporated, without explanation, into the language of the ILT accreditation framework (ILT, 1999).

The educator as situated learner within a community of practice
This model is seen most obviously in the work of Lave and Wenger (Lave and Wenger , 1991) who focus on legitimate peripheral participation (through apprenticeship) as a way of learning the 'culture of practice'. It could of course be argued that an informal apprenticeship is in fact the traditional learning route for teachers in higher education. However the current focus on the use of mentoring schemes and similar inter-generational support methods suggests a more structured and conscious approach to the process of professional learning. The attraction of the ideas of cognitive apprenticeship, socialisation and professional evolution, within a community of practitioners, may be that they incorporate the social world into the educator's identity.

The educator as assurer of organisational quality and efficiency; deliverer of service to agreed or imposed standards
There is a strand of writing on teaching and learning in higher education which focuses on the contribution of teaching to the quality of an institution's activities (e.g. Ellis, 1993; Elton, 1987). This is perhaps not a surprising development given the growth in recent years of monitoring regimes intended to test and maintain the accountability of publicly-funded services. It does, however, raise important ethical questions about the professional role and priorities of the university teacher which, in this country at least, have yet to be analysed in sufficient detail. This model frequently co-exists with the previous one (the psycho-diagnostician and facilitator), creating a 'scientistic' framework which 'constructs subjects (in this case both learners and teachers) in ways which better enable their regulation and control' (Usher and Edwards, 1994, p 33).

We thus have five provisional models to work with. However there are two important omissions in this scheme. The first is the absence, despite the growing popularity of some of Vygotsky's ideas within higher education, of Vygotskian analyses from the categories (including those which refer to learning theory and situated learning). In our view there is often a disturbing selectivity in the ways in which these ideas are described and utilised, which tends to obscure the social, cultural, historical and linguistic elements of Vygotsky's thought. There is therefore a sharp dissonance between 'Vygotsky as he is spoken' in higher education writing, and meaningful discussion or application of his ideas. This requires further analysis before a useful model can be developed.

The second omission is the model of the educator as disciplinary thinker, researcher and actor. There is a long tradition of attempts to analyse the epistemological and other characteristics of disciplines, and their impact on people and structures in higher education (Kuhn, 1970; Lodahl and Gordon, 1972; Biglan, 1973; Becher , 1989). Within the general literature of teaching and learning however, this approach has not really taken root in terms of considering the *pedagogic* implications of the conceptual frameworks of disciplines. Disciplinary questions have moved relatively recently to a new and central position which promises to generate fruitful

conceptualisation (e.g. Caddick, 1999). Once again, we need to analyse instances of this approach in more detail before incorporating it into our 'map' of the field.

In addition to omissions, there are some absences - ideas which we might expect to find in the literature, but which seem to occur either exceptionally or not at all. The most noticeable absence is that of the nature of knowledge, and the teacher's role in its production – a question which has exercised the minds and pens of childhood and adult educators for many years, but around which much of the pedagogic writing in higher education seems to tiptoe with excessive caution. This is clearly linked to the previous point about disciplinary frameworks, and also to the vexed question of who is involved in the production and analysis of pedagogic knowledge. The focus on 'learning', and on individuals, often enables writers to sidestep – consciously or otherwise - the question of what exactly is being learned, by whom and why.

Analysing identities

Haivng tentatively identified certain identities of the educator from the literature, we needed to create tools for analysing them. Our first attempt was to use repertory grid techniques (Fransella and Bannister, 1997) in order to tease out the underlying assumptions of each identity through the generation of constructs. This is useful principally as a 'rough draft' for further analysis, since the constructs identified are inevitably rather crude and approximate.

Briefly, the technique entailed a series of comparisons; each comparison involved three identities, and we considered how, conceptually, two were alike and one was different. We then gave a meaningful name (meaningful to us) for each end of the dimension we had generated. We continued to compare different combinations of identities until we found that we were re-using the same ideas (that is, we had run out of meaningful dimensions). The process helped us identify ten dimensions against which the five usable models could be assessed. In the process of assessment, we rejected one, since it was pertinent to one model only.

The dimensions we identified were:

Learning in a community	<——————>	*Individualised learning*
Disciplinary community	<——————>	*Pedagogic community*
Moral/social accountability	<——————>	*Organisational accountability*
Learner-centred evaluation	<——————>	*Objective measures of learning*
Focus on process	<——————>	*Focus on product*
Content contested	<——————>	*Content as given*
Social orientation	<——————>	*Psychological orientation*
Educator as person in the world	<——————>	*Anonymous/invisible educator*
Learner as person in the world	<——————>	*Anonymous/invisible learner*

We now consider how the two identities most developed in this paper, the educator as cricital practitioner and the educator as psycho-diagnostician, differ along five of the most significant dimensions of pedagogic identity and practice.

Learning within a community vs. individualised learning

The 'critical practice' identity is not difficult to situate along this dimension. It focuses on learning within a community; students and teachers are considered to be social and cultural actors with identities emerging from their wider social experiences. The nature of and relations between their communities are likely to be contested, and this will have a bearing on the processes and content of classroom activity. The conscious social orientation of much adult education practice

means that 'student-centred' pedagogy has to involve the consideration of community identities. The 'educator as psycho-diagnostician', on the other hand, inevitably focuses on the learner as an individual - specifically, as a manifestation of psychological tendencies, processes and dispositions which can be understood and utilised for the purpose of learning. Whilst this perspective does acknowledge relations between individuals, it does not generally extend its scope beyond the classroom transaction to the broader social or cultural context, or the community identities to which this gives rise.

Disciplinary community vs. pedagogic community
Higher education teachers usually conceive of themselves as members of a disciplinary community. The critical practice identity enables teachers to question the content and purpose of their teaching, just as their research questions orthodoxies within the discipline. Within adult education, the knowledge-content of and between disciplines has been interrogated, precisely because the pedagogic role of adult educators could not be divorced from the content of teaching. Critical practice thus allows educators to inhabit 'knowledge-practice' communities which are simultaneously (inter-) disciplinary *and* pedagogic. The educator as psycho-diagnostician, on the other hand, separates the pedagogic from the disciplinary role, assuming the existence of two separate communities. This assumption enables pedagogy to be analysed simply in terms of 'teaching and learning' rather than as an aspect of knowledge production, and in effect creates a superfluous community of (decontextualised) pedagogues. Even where pedagogy is discussed within a disciplinary context, for example in geography or chemistry, disciplinary content is assumed to be intact and unquestioned; the pedagogic role is simply to enable students to learn it. Again, the social purpose of higher education is divorced from action in the classroom.

Moral and social accountability vs. organisational accountability
Educators are always accountable to their organisation, but this dimension focuses on the primacy of organisational accountability over other forms of accountability. All educators are now under pressure to consider the consequences for the organisation of inadequate performance on quality measures, and to adhere to organisational requirements through ever-increasing scrutiny. Sophisticated methods of checking and measuring have been developed (commonly called quality assurance processes) which ensure that the individual educator works in an organisationally appropriate manner.

The psycho-diagnostician can call on any number of procedures and instruments for describing and measuring pedagogic processes and student learning, which makes it easier for her or him to fulfil these new organisational requirements. The absence of content and purpose from the teaching and learning in higher education approach means that few contradictions should be encountered between 'good' pedagogic practice and organisational requirements; measurable evidence of 'student learning' constitutes fulfilment of both. This may indeed be why so many universities are keen to promote the empiricist quick-fixes of the psycho-diagnostician.

But the advent of subject review, the latest articulation of quality assurance in British higher education, has made it increasingly difficult to prioritise moral and social over organisational accountability. Organisational scrutiny demands approved and codified course objectives and content for quality assurance purposes, reducing the scope for pedagogic responsiveness. Thus, for example, the negotiation of the curriculum with students (a prevalent ideal in adult education pedagogy until recently) is quite incompatible with current organisational demands; where knowledge is a commodity, the customer must be given full, or at least convincing, product information. 'The skills of being an academic are increasingly becoming isolated and fragmented

in contexts in which the paramount requirement is to make the work more explicit, so that it can be more easily codified and measured by performance indicators' (Smyth, 1995, p.14).

Educator as 'person in the world' vs. anonymous/invisible educator

The educator as a person in the world - as someone with social identity, and conscious of the 'worldly' baggage present in the classroom - is perhaps such an obvious element of pedagogic identity in adult education that it is taken for granted. We agonise over power relations with students, and conduct vigorous debates about how our gender, class, sexual, or ethnic identity affects what and how we teach. These concerns extend to the content and inclusivity of our disciplines, doubtless informed by the social purpose tradition of adult education and the sociological perspectives which have informed its growing body of theory over time. The 'educator as critical practitioner' is indisputably a person in the world, and this may account for the appeal of, for example, Brookfield's work (1995) to teachers; he addresses them as real people, with real anxieties and frailties. If we turn to the 'educator as psycho-diagnostician', the teacher's reality is generally absent; the teacher has a pedagogic function rather than a social identity. The focus is on the (equally anonymous) learner and the processes occurring within the learner that enable learning to take place. Thus higher education *pedagogy*, where this model is dominant, detaches itself from those issues, such as diversity, that are addressed through social purpose approaches to higher education *policy*.

The student as 'person in the world' vs. anonymous/invisible learner

Within the literature of teaching and learning in higher education, despite its frequent focus on 'the learner', there is little recognition of the socio-cultural situatedness of the individual. The learner frequently appears as an anonymous, decontextualised, degendered being whose principal distinguishing characteristics are 'personality' and 'learning style' (Brown, 1993). This approach, typical of psychometrics, can be traced back to the belief in psychology that it is possible, indeed desirable, to be able to predict people's behaviour. In order to do this, it is presumed that we all have characteristics which determine future actions (eg learning styles which determine how you learn). But this implies that learners 'have' learning styles, preferences and behaviours located somewhere inside them, which exist free of history, culture or context. Indeed, in order to study the individual, contextual and other factors are deliberately excluded from the scientific equation in order to discover universal truths. Thus, the psycho-diagnostician does not need to consider the possibility that 'learning styles' may be constructed through discursive practices or may arise from the learner's history or socio-cultural position, and may not be an 'essential' part of a human being; they are, for the purposes of pedagogic practice, simply there.

The critical practitioner situates the learner very firmly in the social world and in the community of practice. It is impossible to disentangle the learner's situatedness from the educative process. Indeed, in much adult education literature, the age, class, race and gender of learners have been the prime focus of discussion, practice development and policy contestation; an understanding of positionality is integral to an understanding of pedagogy. This has yet to be developed in the literature of higher education pedagogy to any significant degree, despite the vast changes in the student body which have occurred in recent years.

Protective walls

In our exploration of two caricatures of pedagogic identity, we have tried to show the consequences of the split between adult education and higher education pedagogical thinking and writing. We have explored elsewhere some of the reasons why the psycho-diagnostician has gained ascendancy in higher education (Malcolm and Zukas, forthcoming). Briefly, we have argued that part of the problem lies in the relationship between theory and practice. Theory,

rather than representing forms of critical engagement with, and understanding of, practice, appears to take the form of a set of rules for professional behaviour. Teaching, assessment or learning procedures – seating arrangements, student journals, group exercises, action research projects, for example – can be attributed to 'teaching and learning theories', which in turn can be attributed to research on teaching and learning processes. The role of research is to create and refine theories and thus to contribute to the development of rules for practice – in some ways rather like trying out recipes to see if they work.

We are troubled by the epistemological confusion suggested by such a model of research. The psycho-diagnostic higher educator resembles Holmes' 'homunculus with a toolkit' (1999, p89): an anonymous worker, equipped with a portable set of scientistic theories which can be selected as required, and applied systematically to the teaching situation. There is little recognition of theory informing and shaping research, determining the kinds of questions that are asked and the answers that are sought; most crucially there is no hint that the theories which shape research are situated and contestible.

We believe that this naïve version of theory has come about in part because of the separation of disciplinary and pedagogic communities in higher education, and the fracture between research-based and pedagogic communities of practice. A new field of practice, staff and education development in higher education, has emerged separate from disciplinary communities. With its foundations in training, the field has promoted a particular set of understandings and language conventions: outcomes, objectives, assessment and reflection, for example. But this separate language encourages the idea that teaching is a separate and essentially different activity from research. It promotes the dislocation of pedagogic thought and practice from disciplinary knowledge and development.

One of our concerns is that such an approach could be seen to support lifelong learning – after all, if one is able to develop systematically teaching as a distinct activity which bears no relation to context, content or purpose, it could be argued that this would then be transferable across sectoral walls. This could be the basis for a new pedagogy for lifelong learning and teaching. But we believe such an approach omits the most important elements of pedagogy: the relations between educator, student and institution, the social context, purpose and ethical implications of educational work, and the nature and social role of educational knowledge.

For us, the way forward is try to build bridges across the sectoral walls in order to analyse the purposes and consequences of our professional activities. Pedagogy is more than teaching and learning. We assume that it incorporates a critical understanding of the social, policy and institutional context, as well as a critical approach to the content and process of the educational/training transaction. If lifelong learning is the rhetorical vehicle for building such bridges, we should be sure not to undermine its foundations by its narrow linguistic focus on learning.

References

Bailey, F.G. (1977) *Morality and Expediency: the Folklore of Academic Politics* Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Barnett, R. (1997) *Higher Education: A Critical Business* Buckingham: SRHE/Open University

Becher, T. (1989) *Academic Tribes and Territories* SRHE /Open University Press
Biglan, A. (1973) 'The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas' *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57, 3, pp. 195-203
Boyatzis, R.E., Kolb, D. A. (1991) Assessing individuality in learning: the Learning Skills Profile, *Educational Psychology*, 11, 3-4, pp. 279-295.
Boud, D. and Walker, D. (1998) 'Promoting reflection in professional courses: the challenge of context' *Studies in Higher Education* 23, 2, pp.191-206
Bright, B. (1996) 'Reflecting on reflective practice' *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 28, 2, pp. 162-184
Brookfield, S. D. (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* San Francisco: Jossey Bass
Brown, G. (1993) Effective teaching, in Ellis, R. (ed.) *Quality Assurance for University Teaching* Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
Brown, J.S., Collins, A., Duguid, P. (1989) Situated cognition and the culture of learning, *Educational Researcher*, 18, 1, pp. 32-42.
Caddick, M. (1999) 'The atelier principle in teaching', paper presented at Research and Practice in Educational Development(s): Exploring the Links, Stoke Rochford, SEDA/SRHE
Ecclestone, K. (1996) 'The reflective practitioner: mantra or a model for emancipation' *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 28, 2, pp. 146-151
Ellis, R. (1993) *Quality Assurance for University Teaching* SRHE/Open University Press
Elton, L. (1987) *Teaching in Higher Education: Appraisal and Training* Kogan Page
Eraut, M. (1995) 'Schön Shock: a case for reframing reflection-in-action?' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* 1, 1, pp. 9-22
Fransella, F. and Bannister, D. (1977) *A Manual for the Repertory Grid Technique* London: Academic Press.
Gibbs, G. (1992) Improving the quality of student learning through course design, in Barnett, R. (ed.) *Learning to Effect* Buckingham: SRHE/ Open University Press.
Gore, J. (1993) *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth* London: Routledge.
Grenham, G., Wade, P., Kelly, D. (1999) Active learning at the National College of Ireland, paper presented at Research and Practice in Educational Development(s): Exploring the Links, Stoke Rochford: SEDA/SRHE.
Holmes, L. (1999) Competence and capability: from 'confidence trick' to the construction of the graduate identity, in O'Reilly, D., Cunningham, L. and Lester, S. *Developing the Capable Practitioner: Professional Capability through Higher Education.* London: Kogan Page.
ILT (1999) *The National Framework for Higher Education Teaching* Institute for Learning and Teaching
Kuhn, J. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press
Lave, J., Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lodahl, J.B. and Gordon, G. (1972) 'The structure of scientific fields and the functioning of university graduate departments' *American Sociological Review* 37(February) pp. 57-72
Malcolm, J., Zukas, M. (1999) Models of the educator in HE: problems and perspectives, paper presented to STLHE, Collaborative Learning for the 21st Century University of Calgary.
Malcolm, J., Zukas, M. (2000) Becoming an educator: communities of practice in HE, in McNay, I. (ed.) *Higher Education and its Communities* Buckingham: SRHE/ Open University Press) (forthcoming)
Malcolm, J. Zukas, M. (forthcoming) Bridging pedagogic gaps: conceptual discontinuities in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nicol, D., Kane, K. A., and Wainwright, C. L. (1994) 'Improving laboratory learning through group working and structured reflection and discussion' *Educational and Training Technology International* 31, 4, pp. 302- 310

Rowland, S. (1999) Surface learning about teaching in higher education, paper presented to BERA Annual Conference, University of Sussex.

Schön, D. A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* San Francisco Jossey Bass

Smyth, J. (1995) *Academic Work: The Changing Labour Process in Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Tennant, M. (1997) *Psychology and Adult Learning* (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.

Usher, R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and Education* London Routledge

Walker, M. (1999) Doing criticality: mapping a HE project, paper presented at BERA Annual Conference, University of Sussex.

Webb, G. (1996) *Understanding Staff Development* Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Zukas, M. (1988) (ed.) *Transatlantic Dialogue: A Research Exchange.* Proceedings of the Joint SCUTREA/AERC/CASAE Conference. Leeds: University of Leeds.

Zukas, M. and Malcolm, J. (1999) Models of the educator in HE, paper presented to BERA Annual Conference, University of Sussex